G R S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1922
(Inwards)

File No. 450-22

Serial Nos. 1-6

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos. 6

Part B for August 1924

SUBJECT

Review application from Gajanur Channappa, Honnali Kasusi Sub-Taluq praying that on a reconsideration of G.O. dated 13.5.24, the sale of the Inam lands endowed to Sri Ranganathaswami and other temples at Hassahalli, may be confirmed to him.

To The Petitioner.

R.P. 278 dated 22.8.24

There are no fresh grounds for a reconsideration of the order already passed. This application is accordingly rejected.

2286

F. R. S. 11] 19D 2

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Inwards

NOTES.

File No. 453

FILE HEADING.

Sale of the inam lands entered in Sri Narayana Swami, Tirumala Devasthanam and Jobi Hanumantha Devasthanam temples at Harnahalli Hyderabad Sub-Deposit.

From

Bhishappa, Mahata and Valivahar.

No. Petition Dated Received

Diary No. 2286	Enclos.	Spare Copies.	Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

(copy petition) Prays for the cancellation of the sale of the Inam of the inam lands entered in the name of the temples and also for the grant of the Inam lands to the temples.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

B. The petition is duly stamped. This is an appeal against the Inam Commr's order, an authenticated copy of which has been produced. The Inam Commr's order is dated 6.1.39

NOTES—First Sheet.

Serial No.

while the appeal was filed
on 18-6-1923.
The Inc Comr's ordered
to go fully into the facts
of the case. The Cast para
of the order specifies the
Condition. Subject to which
the Inc Comr is prepared
to order the cancellation
of the sale of the land.
and the appellant is not
prepared to abide by these
Conditions — A stay order is
submitted for orders

20-6-23 The Reserve fund
asked by the Comr
& the same has been given in
full. Vide para 2 of G.O No 2101/Misc 27-22
dt 18-1-23, and the Hon Comr.
to whom the Dy Comr referred the
Appellants for cancellation of
order has ordered the Comr
to conduct enquiry in the
matter. The Inc is fixed on 25-6-23
from there enquiry
the Dy Comr will
forward his

T

NOTE—Contn. sheet

Gr. R. S. III-21

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 450 of 1972.

Serial No.

B { lands which have been in their possession for decades past.

A { a stay order may perhaps be given & the report in the records called for.

5
(1st Member)

29/6/73

Bb
27/6/73

105-5-6-706
29.6.73

6 A. approved.

7 B Any claims in the case of such lands have been recorded in other files, which may be looked up. One of them is that relating to the temple of Varadarajaswamy (?) at Madras.

Pms
30.6.73

2/7/73

Put Hdm in here
Seen Ben 4 July 73

Put Submit with DOS.

Issue

3/7/73

3/7/73

2 No. 11 ✓ to the Hon'ble Minister.

Concur.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

R. S. III-21

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 452 of 19 ?

Serial No.

Directs him to stay execution of the sale of the inam lands enjoyed by the inistns pending orders of Govt on the appeal petition -

3. From, the Inspn Comr no. C. 14 Dy 4. 9. 23.

Submits the records connected with the case and reports that the land belonging to the Vahivat of the appellants were purchased in auction by Channappa and Khader mohadin, that Channappa had been put in possession of the lands by him before the receipt of the stay order, and that he has raised crops, and that a distn would cause loss to the inistn.

A. The facts of the case are contained in the office note prepared in the Dy. Comrs. office.

The temples of Sri Varay Swami, Tirumala Devaru, Praya Alvaru & Pala Bisya devaru, and Jibi Hanumantha Devaru.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-21

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. | of 19 21

Serial No.

at Haunahalli, Kunsi Sub-Taluk, are Inzrai institutions endowed with inam lands. During the inam settlement of 1872, the lands were registered as Devadayam and it is noted that they were in the enjoyment of chickrum Bhut (vide extract from the Inam Register.)

B.

C

D, E.

During the Inzrai Sristadar's inspection in 1917, it was found that the temple buildings were maintained in good order, and that Worship was being properly conducted etc.

(G.H.S).

A revised Scale was Sanctioned in October 1918, and the Vahivadars were required to maintain regular accounts, and perform Services in the temples under the Control of Dharmadarsi paying regularly into the Treasury the reserve amounts for repairs etc. The Vahivadar however failed to deposit the reserve amounts. The matter

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-21

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 450 of 1922

Serial No.

came up before The Dy. Comr. Mr. G. Aravamudiengar who observed that the conditions on which the Valivarsdars were allowed to be in possession of the lands had not been fulfilled, that none of them paid up the reserve amounts, and directed that the sale should be confirmed. The parties went up to the Asst. Comr. who was of opinion that the lands having fetched a great deal more by auction, the sales have to be confirmed in the interests of the inams. He ordered that if the appts. paid the whole amount with a stipulated time with interest and compensation, the sale would be set aside. Against the foregoing order, Valivarsdar has appealed to Govt. praying that by him the inams allowed to be may be retained subject to

(Appeal petition)

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

payment of Reserve fund. The grounds for appeal are summarized in the petition.

13 In evidence of long enjoyment, the appellant has produced

V. a copy of Sanad dated unknown, signed granted by Sivappa, granting inam land for the ~~use~~ and worshipper- his document was produced at the time of the Inam Settlement also.

C (vide colm^n 11 of the Register).

W. Arrears of reserve amounts from 1918-9 & 1921-2 have since been paid up (vide Hukum from the Taluk Office).

In para 2 of G.O. No. 2101 dt 18-1-1923, Govt have approved the levy

A

WD 0561-GPB—3750—1 8.22

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. 1.52 of 1922

Serial No.

Suggestion that in respect of all minors whether major or minor, the possession of the lands by the temple servants who have been long in enjoyment of them may be left undisturbed for they are willing to pay annually such sum as may be fixed - the applt complains that the lands have been improved by them at great cost, that they have also the greed of other ryots who have tried to snatch them away from their lands. Just when they have begun to derive some benefit, that the lands have been in their enjoyment for more than

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 0561—GPB—3750—1 8-22

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. of 192[illegible]

Serial No.

200 years ele

The previous member of Council before whom the appeal petition went up for orders, has recorded the minute that his views in the case of such inams have been recorded in other files which might be looked up, one of them being that relating to Holegere Sri Anjaneya Swami temple at Hadkur.

J.

Muz. J. no. 291-18 on the subject is put up. In G.O. no. 1363-6 dt 9.9.21, in view of the proved long possession, the inam lands have been allowed to remain in possession

NOTE—Contn sheet

WD 0561—GPB—3750—1 8 22

323 10

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. 150 of 192 22

Serial No.

of the family on specified Conditions.

Submitted for orders. This case is in all forms with that dealt with in Mar file 209/23. 291-18, and the appellants in this case stand in the same position in which those of the referred file (291-18) stood. The Inams should be retained in their possession in virtue of their long enjoyment, as part of a reserve fund in favour of the temple. (Vide also G.O. No. 2101/Mar 187 22-2 dt. 1.23)

21.9.23 (Rev. Secy) 22/9/23

20) What are the rights of Valivalthars? Put up the last orders on this subject. 21/9/23

Hiltuvalli case.

21) The duties & rights of Valivarthars are defined in this G.O. No. 1805-6/Mar 185-12-1, dated the 19th Jan: 1917

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 0361-GPB-3750-1 8 22

G. R. S. III. 2]

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. 450 of 1922

11

Serial No.

While passing order in the Case of the Hiluvalli Venkataramana Swamis Temple -Sthalakoodaa- in Sirsi land. This case was decided by the Dewan and both the members of Council at a hearing and the orders were approved by H. H. the Maharaja - The Maharaja's rights & duties have been defined as follows: —

1) The temples and their properties should be placed in charge of the Valmiki dar.

2) His obligations so far as the temples are concerned are to provide for a minimum expenditure for worship, & to maintain the Temples buildings in sufficient State & to pay Rent due on the land.

3) To set apart annually a minimum reserve to accumulate for the purpose.

(Vide para 3 of the order above referred to).

WD 0561—GPB—3750—1 6 22

NOTE—Contn. sheet

26/9/23 Revised)

Dec 7/1924

(12

G. R. S. 111·21

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. 450 of 192 2

Serial No.

22) Send all these Temple files also. Please put them up

AV 19/9

23) The under-mentioned files on the subject, directing the leasing out of temple lands for 5 yrs. are herewith submitted:—

(1) 534-15, (2) 203-19 (3) 259-16 K,
J, J,
(4) 269-16-
L,

AV 24) The notes in the files
29.9.23. put up for reference point to the fact that generally the holders of the lands i.e. Vokkaligas who have been in possession of the lands for a long no. of years should be left in possession of them provided they pay Govt. dues and a reasonable amt as reserve fund to the temple. provided also they maintain the temple building in proper condition. The late first member has specially mentioned in his note dated 29-1-22 (Mem 291-22) in the summary file (Mem

NOTE—Contn. sheet

(G R. S. III-2]

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. 457 of 1922.

Serial No.

which he says indicates the procedure to be adopted, and Mur: File no 185-12 is also one in which the rights & liabilities of various persons are specifically indicated.

25) The appellants in the case now in point have been holding the lands for many a very long time past and should be retained in possession on the conditions set forth above.

Rev. Sec.

29/9/23

29/9/23

26) The full observations

Orders in [illegible] & dated 27-11-917.

27) The appellant is only a Vahivatdar of the temple and he cannot be allowed to claim the inam land in question, which is endowed to the temple, as his own and deprive the institution of the increased profits accruing therefrom from time to time.

Second Member 13/10/23

24 hours for reasons to be recorded separately

13/10

16/10/23.

NOTE—Contn. sheet

33
3.10.23.

WD 0561—GPB—3750—1 5 22

G. R. S. 111—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

28) Muzrai appeal Case no 3. 1923-24
is posted for hearing
before the members of
Council on the 24th inst
at 10 a.m.

29) The file will be
sent on 2 the members
Office for being placed
before the member
of Council

30) yr
22 11 23

22. 11. 23 22/11/23

Put up to the Secretary Advt & the 2nd. member with
Compts

22/11/23

559
22 11.23

N B — Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form

G R S. III—

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record]

N B.—Should lengthy notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

W D 1860—GPP—1 50 000—25 01

24/11/22 15

31) For applicant (Shemeran)

Shemeran will
1- [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

Respondent [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

12 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

Respondent has deposited
[illegible] 400 [illegible]
He deposited [illegible]
in March (or April)
1922

Date fixed
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

G. R. S. [illegible]

Muzrai Secretariat

Muz. File No. 450 of 192[illegible]

16

Serial No

(Appeal Case No. 3 of 1923-24)

32) Dft. Notices submitted by Mr. 10.23. Issue Rule 25/10/23

33) Case heard and reserved for orders. 24-11-23.

Order

34) As a matter of policy, Vakeels of the Archaks, the humble servants who have been long in possession of the Swamy lands, should be retained as hereditary trustees, so long as they are prepared to pay such amounts as may be fixed by the Board towards the administration expenses; and this policy has been approved by Govt. in their order dt. 18th Jan. 23.

35) In the present case, the appellants [illegible] to be trustees on their own proposal. As they failed to pay Rs. [illegible] as the amount fixed by the Board (alternative) although they were given [illegible] to do so, their appeal is dismissed with costs.

NOTE—Contn sheet

WD 0561—GPB—3750—1 8 22

Muzrai Secretariat

Muz. File No. 450 of 192 2

Serial No

However as the applicants have since reported that they have taken a lease of the lands in arrears for the annual payments due from them and as in the best interests of the undertaking a progress charge of Rs. not exceeding as large as is now in force may be levied on a fixed minimum in the first instance, it is ~~proposed~~ recommended in the ~~first~~ final determination of the lands of which the ~~Survey~~ 36) it is desired to notify the Muz. commissioner that the applicants be ~~allowed~~ and further in the ~~interests of the undertaking~~, as possession of the lands his progress at compensation at 12% on the amount ~~of~~ the purchase price of the lands ~~who has~~ as ~~have~~ not yet been paid in respect of the lands leased as ~~from~~ the ~~Survey~~ and in respect of the ~~Survey~~ purchasers ~~who have~~ charges it have been already paid in respect of the lands ~~Survey~~ compensation as the D.C. may ~~direct~~ fix, remarks in the circumstances of the case.

26/4

NOTE—Contn sheet

WD 0561—GPB—3750—1 8 22

AV 26/4

26/4/22

Muzrai Secretariat

Muz. File No. 450 of 1922

16
18

Serial No.

37) Dft. order submitted.

AG
29.6.24

38) A small alteration in the wording in the order portion is suggested for appl. opln appl. A fair draft will be sub?.

BL
29.4.24

39) Fair draft. Please see

attended to.

1 remarks on draft.

D
2.5.24.

Fair Dft submitted.

AG
5.5.24.

BL
5/5/24.

40) Issue

~~Dft appd~~

D
7.5.24

4 To the Muzrai Commr. Mems. No. 16494 dt. 13.5.24. fds. a copy of G.O. directing that the appellants be kept in undisturbed possession of the lands on their paying as compensation interest at 12 % on the amount paid by the auction purchasers to Khader Mohideen who has not yet been put in

NOTE—Contn. sheet

S. III-2].

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. 450 of 1922

Serial No.

Channappa who has been put in possession of the lands, such compensation as the A. C. may consider just & reasonable.

5. From Channappa.

Petition dt 22/24 8 May 1924,

Prays that on a re-consideration of the order conveyed in Sl. 4, the sale of the temple inam lands in favor of the petr be confirmed.

41) The review petition is duly stamped. The order was passed on 13.5.1924, while the petition was received on 24.7.1924. It is in time.

42) The grounds for review are summarized in the petition. The petr says that

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 0561—GPB—3750—1 8 22

Serial No.

he will not spoil temple lands, and that he is prepared to enter into an agreement undertaking to pay Rs 200/ more than that has been realized by sales of the Sultan ji the inam lands for a period of 5 years after the expiry of the present lease.

43) The petn. further complains that the temples have all been neglected by the his opponents, for want of timely repairs, and the inam lands are not properly cultivated by them etc. If enquired, a report will be called for on these points.

Submitted -

30.7.24

44) The order ought to be reviewed

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 0561—GPB—3750—1 8 22

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. 457 of 1922

Serial No.

was passed after due consideration and after hearing the parties. The review Petn may be rejected.

30/7/24 45) Mr. Ramachandra Aiyar.

18/8.

46) A copy of the Muz Regn is submitted.

4.8.24

6.8.1924

47) Sec 12 of the Muz Regn Cuddapah in para 2 The Revision Petition has no application to the present case. The appeal may be rejected

9.8.24

2nd member

48) I agree

16/8

49) Dft. sent submitted.

18.8.24 18/8/24

50) Issue

18/8

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 0561—GPB—3750—1 8 22

Muzrai Secretariat

Muz. File No. 450 of 1922

Serial No.	
6	To petitioner Channappa. No. 278 d. 22.8.24. Informs him that there are no fresh grounds for a reconsideration of the orders already passed & rejects his application.
	" Muzrai Commr's. No. 279 d. 22.8.24. Forwards copy of the above for information.

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 0561—GPB—3750—1 8 22

ONE RUPEE ONE RUPEE

19 JUN 1923
MUZRAI

D 2288

450. M-1

To

The First-Member of Council to
The Government of Mysore,
Bangalore

Received on 18 June 23

Respected Sir,

I the Archak and Vahivatdar of Sree Narayanswamy Tirumala devaru and Jobi Hanumanthadevaru Temples at Haranahalli, Kumsi Sub Taluk, beg to bring the following facts for your kind consideration and favourable orders.

2 The above three temples though falling under the head of Village Institutions, have been clubbed together and brought under minor muzrai institutions.

3 The scale of these institutions were fixed in the year 1918-19 and I was asked to pay a sum of Rs 29-2-9 annually towards the reserve and other funds allotted in the scale in addition to the Jodi etc., which came up to about Rs 45/- I agreed to this and to conduct service in the temples in accordance with the scale sanctioned.

4 On account of failure of monsoon in that and in the next year I was obliged to borrow money for the regular conduct of worship in the temples. In these years, remissions and also concessions for the payment of kandayam on Government lands were granted on account of draught. Under these circumstances I was not in a position to pay anything towards reserve fund.

5 In the meanwhile steps were taken to auction the main lands attached to the temples as I did not pay the Reserve Fund The lands were auctioned and the sale was confirmed for 5 years

by the Deputy Commissioner on 29th May 1922

I placed all these above facts before the Deputy Commissioner and he asked us to credit the amount due by us upto that date towards reserve fund and then appeal against his orders for the cancellation of the sales. Accordingly I paid a sum of Rs 116-11-0 being the amount due for 4 years on 5th June 1922 and preferred an appeal to the Muzrai Commissioner.

The Muzrai Commissioner has in his order No. R Dis 85/22-23 dated 6th April 1923, a copy of which is herein enclosed, directed that as the lands have fetched a great deal more by auction and in the interest of the temples, the sales be confirmed.

In this connection I beg to bring to your kind notice that these lands are being enjoyed by our ancestors and myself for more than 200 years and we have spent a great deal of money in order to improve the lands as well as the temple buildings. In times of draught I conducted the services in the temples by borrowing the money. These temples were built by our ancestors and they are in good condition These lands were given to our ancestors by the palace receiving some consideration by Sivappa. The original Sannad has been placed in Museum and a copy thereof has been granted to us by the Late Chief Commissioners. A copy of the same is also herewith enclosed for your kind perusal.

The lands having been improved at a great cost and seeing that they begin to yield crops, they have attracted the greed of other ryots who have tried to snatch them away from our hands. Our opposite party on the motive of depriving me of my livelihood, has taken on lease for a big amount for five years. It is doubtful if the man will even pay the yearly lease amount, his only interest being to deprive me of my lands.

As I am ready to conduct the services in the temple according to the scale sanctioned and to pay contribution towards the reserve funds etc., allot d t , I humbly pray that the

accordance with Government order No. 2101/ M.F.187-22-2 - 9
dated 18th January 1923.

11 The lessee is trying to take possession of the lands. As I have paid the contribution and as I will be put to much loss if the lands are given possession to the lessee I humbly beg that a stay order may be issued till my case is disposed of by Government. The voucher for having paid the contribution at 29-2-9 for four years is herein enclosed in original for kind perusal and return.

12 I again pray that a stay order may be issued and the sale of lands may be cancelled and my only means of livelihood restored to me.

13 For which act of kindness I shall ever feel grateful.

I beg to remain,
Respected Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
[illegible]

Bangalore
18th June 1923

HT·ANNAS [illegible]

In the Court of the Munsif
Commissioner in Mysore
Bangalore.

Munsif appeal No 3 of 1922-23.

Appellant.
Bistappa
Vaivatdar of
Sri Varasimha Devaru
& other temples at
Haranahalli
Kumsi Sore Taluk.

Respondent
Gazanur Channappa
Gowda
Haranahalli
Kumsi Sore Taluk

Subject:— Appeal petition No 3 dated 9th Sept 1922 of Bhistappa, Vaivatdar of Sri Varasimha Devaru, Tirumaladevaru, and Sri Hanumantha Devaru of Haranahalli village, Kumsi Sore Taluk, against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga District, confirming the sales of the lease of lands endowed to the above temple, and in the enjoyment of the appellant.

Facts of the case:—

The records received

~~7~~ 27/

the Deputy Commissioner's letter No. H.C. 137 22-23 dated the 1st December 1922 show that the lease of the inam lands endowed to the above temples and in the enjoyment of the Valivatdar appellant were sold and the sales confirmed by the Deputy Commissioner in his order of 29th May 1922 for the reason that the condition on which the Valivat of the temple and the inam lands was allowed to be in the possession of the Valivatdar were not fulfilled and the amounts reserved for the repairs and extraordinary calls of the temple were not paid for 3 years together. The sale of the lease ~~each~~ fetched (Rs 53½/- per annum, Sowcar Chennappa of Haranahalli having purchased the major portion for Rs 45-7½-. The appellant paid in the 4 years (1918-19 to 1921-22) reserve amount only subsequently (i.e. on 5-6-1922). Sowcar Channappa in his petition dated 8th January 1922 urges being put in possession of these lands and the inam lands of Sri Mukhya Prana devaru and Sri Gopalakrishna devaru in the same village the lease of which also was sold for similar default and purchased by him for Rs 218-10-0 on the score that he has paid in the required deposit of Rs 3.3.8/- immediately the sale and delay in giving possession

I humbly pray that the sale

Order No. R dis 85 of 22-23 dated
Encl: one big file
Bangalore 6th April 1923.

The parties were ~~heard~~ heard on the 27th March 1923, through their Council Mr. C. Krishnaraos on behalf of the appellant and Mr. B. Shankar Rao on behalf of the auction purchaser. The lands have fetched a great deal more by auction and in the interests of the temple, the sales have to be confirmed. The appellant was as a matter of consideration given the option of paying up the amount now realized. He first pleaded inability and subsequently said he would pay up the same amount. On the other hand, the respondent says that the other lands would not be of value to him without those under appeal. In this circumstance it is ordered that if the appellant pays the whole amount of Rs 677-0-0 within a month together with interest at 12% per annum for compensation and also security for paying the annual kave-- amount punctually in future years, the sale will be set aside. Otherwise he should be evicted and the purchasers of the lands in.

an auction sale in possession of me

(Signed) H. Chaudhry

Mukhtiar Commissioner

To

The Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga District.

"Copy"

Mukhtiar Commissioner 16/6/23.

Date of application 29.3.23.

Date of when Copy was ready 4.4.23

Date of delivery to party 16.6.23

No of words 516

Amount 0-12-0

Comparing fees 0-2-0 } 0-14-0

Copied by Bramarathna

Compared by H. Narasimha Rao Clerk

Seal of:

The Commissioner for the Government of the Territories of the Raja of Mysore.

Also both in Hindustani and Kannada

Kharaviramapayanamukhantra, the Petitioner Lingabhatta, grand son of Gundavadhani Naranabhatta, as per orders of Palace, was doing the pujas in the temples of Narayana Devaru, Tirumale Devaru and Gibi Hanumantha Devaru in the village of Harnahalli, Kumsi Sub Taluk. The Palace - authorities, after receiving 60 (sixty) Varahas from the Petitioner, were pleased to bestow the following lands for the benefit and management of the temple and worshipper. - Since then the petitioner went on performing the pujas, &c., enjoying these privileges granted by the Palace Authorities. It is also ordered that the Smarthas should not - worship in the Vishnu Temples. Out of the lands allotted to Gibi Hanumantha Devaru, some portion had been converted, as per Palace Orders, as Thurumandi land. On our entreaties to the Palace about this Thrumundy land, the Palace - Authorities were pleased to compensate this by way of giving some Government land in Harnahalli village. Upon the petitioner's representation that he would arrange to conduct pujas, &c., through Vishnavas, as per cumtomes, the - Palace Authorities took 100 Varahas (one hundred) from the Petitioner and in place of the aforesaid land granted in Harnahalli village out of Government land, a piece of land ~~granted~~ adjascent to this was granted and took for this 3 Varahas and 3 Hanas as Sarva Inam. It was also arranged that this Linghabhatta alone should conduct the pujas of the said three temples through a Vishanava, and the

the lands granted newly as well as the lands originally belonged to these temples were ordered to be given as Inam on Sree Mukha Samvastrada Jesta Bahula Panchami. Accordingly, the old compensated lands as well as newly - given ones were given to the petitioner to enjoy the complete privilege, in return to the pujas of the said three Devarus (Gods) and it was also settled that this Linghabhatta and his future descendants only should enjoy this privilege and that the Petitioner and his other future - descendants should conduct the pujas in the Gibi Hanumantha Devaru Temple through a Vishnava only for ever. The Palace Authorities only are to take the amount directly from the Petitioner. The whole was also ordered to be entered in the Shanbhogue's Kadata (Book). This order was given in place of the old order, in this connection.

Sd. Sivappa,

The original document on Cudjan leaf of which the above is a copy having been deposited in the Mysore Museum, this copy is delivered in lieu thereof.

" By Order "

Sd. Offg: Secretary to the Chief Commissioner of Mysore.

Copy.

Signed by M. D. C. Subbarao

Muz. 41

SUBJECT ..... 9 DC. .....

Diary No. of letter replied to _____

Section Mar

File No. 450-22

Serial No. 2

Muzrai Secretariat

( )

, *the* 192 .

No. 11 four

Date of issue 3-7-23

To

The Muzrai Comr

Signed by Sri D.C. Subbarao Sri Asst

I am directed to forward herewith for report his recent petition regd. no 2288 from Bhistappa, Archak and Vaikhanasa of Sri Narayana Swami and other temples at Hanahalli Kasaba Sub

over.

341

appealing against your
order in the matter
of the sale of the
Suttia of the Civil Courts
enclosed herewith.
I am also to request that
you will be so good as
to stay execution of
the order appealed
against, pending
the final disposal by
of the appeal
petition.

I have &c

Sd/- [illegible] 3/7/23
Asst Secretary

Sd/-
3/7/23

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

WD 0563—GPB—2,500—27-7-22

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to _____

Section Mar

File No. 450 - 22

Serial No. —

Muzrai Secretariat

( )

, the 192 .

No. 12

Date of issue 3.7.23

To

Signed by M. D. Subbarayappa

Endorsement granted to Bhimappa, Archak and Vahivatdar of Shri Narayana Swami and other temples at Harnahalli, Kunigal Taluq, with reference to his petition dated 20.6.23 No. 2288 applying for the Inam Cancelled

over.

re the matter of the
Sale of the Main Lands
Enclosed & the Cistern.

In reply, the
Petr is informed
that a report with
records has been
called for from the
Insp. Genl., who has
been requested to stay
execution of the order
appealed against
pending disposal of
the petition. By order,

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

(Sd) Rec. Secretary

WD 0563—GPB—2,900-27-7-22

3/7/23.

Dated, Bangalore, the 3rd September 1923.

4

From

K. Chandy, Esquire, B.A.,

Mu.rai Commissioner in Mysore,

9338

Bangalore.

GEN & REV SEC
7 SEP 1923
MUZRAI

To

GEN. & REV. SECTT
Br Muz
6 SEP 1923
G. D. SECTION

T.S. Jayarama Aiyar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Revenue Department,

Bangalore.

D 307

456-22-3

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.11 Muz.456-22-2 dated 3rd July 1923 forwarding for report with records petition of Bistappa, archak and Vaidyadar of Sri Narayana Mandir and other temples at Harnahalli, Kumsi Sub Taluk, appealing against my order in the matter of the lease of the inam lands granted to the above institutions, I have the honor to submit the records received from the Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga District and the file of this office also and to state that the Deputy Commissioner who was in pursuance of instructions of Government, required to stay execution of the order of this office pending the final disposal of the appeal by Government reports in his letter No.13 Rev.36-24 dated 23rd August 1923 (copy of which is herewith submitted) that the lands belonging to the Vaidyadar of appellant Bistappa were purchased at auction by Channappa and Khader Boladeer, that Channappa had been put in -- possession of the lands purchased by him before the receipt of the stay order and that he has raised crops thereon and that in this circumstance a disturbance of possession would cause loss of rent to the institution.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

K. Chandy

Muzrai Commissioner.

D.N.

a.k

Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga [illegible]

- - - - - .

"With reference to your letter No.C.14 of 23-24 dated the 9th July 1923, I have the honor to submit herewith the entire records as noted in the *margin, re: the sale of the kutha of the inam lands endowed to Sri Narayana-swamy and -- other temples at Tarnahalli in Kumsi Sub Taluk as called for, in the above letter.

* 1. Appeal memo received with Muzrai Commissioner's No.C.14/23-24 dated 9th July 1923.	endowed to
2. One file of records confirming the sale of the right of cultivation of the inam lands of the institution.	Sri Narayana-swamy and --
3. One file of records received with I.O.No.C.1048/ 22-23 dated 3-7-23 from the Sub Division -- Officer, Tirthahalli.	other temples at Tarnahalli

The facts of the case are fully set forth in this office note (vide file No.3).

The Assistant Commissioner in charge of Tirthahalli Sub ~~Division~~ Division, in submitting the connected records with his No. I.C.1048/ 22-23 dated 3rd July 1923 and in his subsequent report dated 6th August 1923, states that the lands belonging to the Vahivat of appellant Phishtappa were purchased in auction by Channappa and Khadar Mohadeen;, that the lands purchased by Channappa have been put in his possession before the receipt of the stay order under reference and that he has raised the crops therein; that it is likely to -- cause loss in respect of rent due to the institution if the lands are restored to Phishtappa the appellant and that the lands purchased by Khadar Mohadeen are not yet put in his possession, as he is away from the place."

Copy.

for Muzrai Commissioner.

D.F.

EIGHT ANNAS

SECRETARIAT
MUZRAI

D323

ಸೇವೆಯಲ್ಲಿ

ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಸಚಿವರು
ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಸರ್ಕಾರ
ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು

ಮಾನ್ಯರೇ,

ವಿಷಯ: ಶ್ರೀ ಕೊಲ್ಲೂರು ಮೂಕಾಂಬಿಕಾ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನದ ಆಡಳಿತ ಮಂಡಳಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ನೇಮಕಾತಿ ಬಗ್ಗೆ.

ಕೊಲ್ಲೂರು ಶ್ರೀ ಮೂಕಾಂಬಿಕಾ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನದ ಆಡಳಿತ ಮಂಡಳಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ನೇಮಕಾತಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಂದ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಆಹ್ವಾನಿಸಿ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆ ಹೊರಡಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ಕೊನೆಯ ದಿನಾಂಕವನ್ನು ದಿನಾಂಕ 18-9-1923 ಎಂದು ನಮೂದಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದೆ ಇರುವ ಅನೇಕ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ಕೊನೆಯ ದಿನಾಂಕವನ್ನು ಮುಂದೂಡಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಕೋರಿಕೆ.

ಇಂತಿ ತಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸಿ

ದಿನಾಂಕ: 10-9-1923

ಸ್ಥಳ: ಕೊಲ್ಲೂರು

ಸೇವೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಪತ್ರ

ಸ್ವೀಕಾರಪತ್ರ ಕಾಲಾವಧಿ 15 ವರ್ಷಗಳವರೆಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಂಚಿಮಠದ ಶ್ರೀಮಠದ ಅಧಿಕೃತ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರು

ಕಾಶಿ ಶ್ರೀಮಠದ ಶ್ರೀಮಠದ ಅಧಿಕೃತ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರು

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಂಚಿಮಠದ ಶ್ರೀಮಠದ ಅಧಿಕೃತ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರು

ಒರೂ ONE RUPEE ಘಟ್ಟ-I

ಒರೂ ONE RUPEE ಘಟ್ಟ-I

The below ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಜಡ್ಜ್ ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ಗೆ.
mentioned
municipal

1923-24ನೇ ಇದಿಲ್ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಂಬರು.
M.P.5

one

ಅರ್ಜಿಲು ವಾದಿ ಯಾ ~~ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್~~; ಅರ್ಜಿಲು ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ ಯಾ ~~ಅಪೋನೆಂಟ್~~

1. ಅಶ್ವತ್ಥ ಬಿ ಪೈಲೆ
2. ಬಾಲಚಂದ್ರ ಪೈಲೆ
3. ಅಶೋಕ್ ಪೈಲೆ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರರು

Vs.

ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಜಡ್ಜ್ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಅವರಿಗೆ

ಬರಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್‌ನಾಮಾ

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಆಖೈರುವರೆಗೂ ಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವಾದ ಜರಗಿಸುವ ದಕ್ಕೂ, ನನ್ನ ಪರ ಆಗುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಧವಾದ ಆರ್ಡರನ್ನೂ ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯನ್ನೂ ಜಾರಿಕ್ರಮ ನಡಿಸಿ ಹಣ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ, ನನಗೆ ಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಿಂದ ಸಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಮೊಬಲಗು, ಕಿಲ್ಲು ಮೊಬಲಗು ಸಹ ಪಡಿಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ, ದಸ್ತೈವಜು ವಗೈರೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ಪಡಿಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹ ತಮಗೆ ಈಮೂಲಕ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತಾವಾಗಲೀ ಯಾ ತಮ್ಮಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಮತ್ತ್ಯಾವ ಲಾಯರಾಗಲಿ ಡಿಟೋ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡಿಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲುಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ.

23-11-23
ತಾರೀಖು

ರುಜು ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯವರ ಸಾಕ್ಷಾದಾರರಿಂದ

ಈ ವಕಾಲತ್‌ನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯಸ್ಥರಾಗಿ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

23/11/23

ಈ ವಕಾಲತ್‌ನಾಮೆ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ

Adv.
23/11/23

ಯಂ. ಪಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಯ್ಯ ಬುಕ್‌ಡಿಪೊ, ಶ್ರೀ ನಂದೀಕ ಭಾರತಿ ವಿಲಾಸ ಪ್ರೆಸ್, ಚಿಕ್ಕಪೇಟೆ, ಬಿ-ಸಿಟಿ.

Received before
the Board member
[illegible]

ವಕಾಲತ್‌ನಾಮಾ.

In the Court of Before the Government of H. H. Maharaja of Mysore
Bangalore ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ.

Mysore appeal ನಂಬರು 1923—1924 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ.

ವಾದಿ (ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್)		ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ (ಎದುರರ್ಜಿದಾರ್)
Appellants 1 Bistappa 2 Jayatheerthacher 3 Krishtachar	Vs.	Respondents 1 Chennappa 2 Khader Mohadeen

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ

ಮಾ॥ ರಾ॥ ಅಡ್ವೊಕೇಟ್ ಡಿ. ಶಾಮರಾವ್, ಬಿ. ಎ., ಎಲ್‌ಎಲ್.ಬಿ., ಯವರಿಗೆ.

We, the appellants abovenamed ಬರೆಯಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್‌ನಾಮೆ.

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನ ವರವಾಗಿ ತಾವು ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆ ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೂ, ಆರ್ಜಿ ವಗೈರೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು, ವಿನಾದಿಸಿ ಫೈಸಲ್ ಹೊಂದತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಯೂ, ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಜಾರೀ ಕ್ರಮ ನಡೆಸತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಯೂ, ದಸ್ತೈವಜು ವಗೈರೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ರಶೀದಿ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೂ, ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ವಾವಸು ಆಗತಕ್ಕ ದಾವಾ ನ್ಯಾಂವು, ವ್ಯೋನೆನ್ ನ್ಯಾಂವು, ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಹಣ, ಮತ್ತು ನಾಕ್ಷೆ ಭತ್ಯ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ ಇತರ ವಿಧವಾದ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಮೊಬಲಗು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹ ತಮಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವೇ ಆಗಲಿ ತಮಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಇನ್ಯಾವ ಲಾಯರೇ ಆಗಲಿ ನನಿಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ನಡೆಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡೆಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಲು ಇದರಿಂದ ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಮೊಖ್ತ್ಯಾರ್‌ನಾಮೆಯನ್ನು
ಕೊಡುವವರ ರುಜು ಮತ್ತು ತಾರೀಖು

1 [illegible]
2 [illegible]
3 [illegible]

ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತ್ಯಾನಾಮೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಿಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯಸ್ಥರು ಮತ್ತು ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

Accepted
D Shamarao
Advocate for the appellants.

Dated 24/11/23

1031–22 ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಪ್ರೆಸ್, ವಿ. ಸೂರ್ ರೋಡ್, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ

APPEAL No. 3 OF 1923-4.

APPELLANTS

(1) Bistāppa.
(2) Jayatirthachar, and
(3) Krishtachar.

RESPONDENT.

(1) Channappa,
(2) Khadem mohadin

SUBJECT.

Appeal against order
No. R. Dis. 85 of 22-23
dy 6th April 1923 of
the Muznai Court in Mysore
in the matter of the
Sale of the Suttu of
The inam lands endowed
to Sri Narayana Swami,
Tirumala Devaru and
Jibi Hanumantha
Devaru temples at
Harnahalli in the
Kunigal Sub-Taluk.

~~Order~~

The case was heard
on 24th Novr 1923

The parties were present in person & the apltrs were represented by their Advocate Mr. D. Shama Rao while the 1st respondent was represented by his Adv. Mr. B. S. Ranoji Rao.

order

As a matter of policy, Vahivatdars and Archaks and other temple servants who have been long in possession of the inam lands attached to the institution, should not be disturbed from the possession of the lands, so long as they are prepared to pay such amount as may be fixed by the local officers towards land tax/assessment

Shall this note be Reserved Jus

Govt. in their order
no. 2101 / Mus. 187-22 dt
18th January 1923.
In the present case,
the apllts are themselves
responsible for the
position in which they
are placed as they
failed to pay regu-
larly the amount
fixed by the local
officers and there was
therefore no alternative
left for them but
to dispose of the lease
of the lands by auction.
However, as the apllts
have ~~since~~ been represented to
to have ~~since~~ since repented
of ~~his~~ their folly, and paid
up in full the arrears
of the annual ~~payment~~ Payment
due &

WD 0'65—GPB—2000—28 7 22

due from them. ~~and is~~ in the best interests of the inst^n, a frequent change of lessees is not desirable, as though it brings in a good income in the first instance, it results in the gradual deterioration of the lands and ultimate loss to the institution.

~~It is directed in~~ for reasons ~~which~~ in modification of the Mag. Comr's order that the apltz be left ~~the~~ undisturbed in the possession of the lands on their paying as compensation interest @ 12% on the amount paid by the auction purchasers Khadeer Mohadin who has not yet

in the best interests or ~~It is also not~~ ~~desirable to change~~ change of lessees ~~frequently~~ is not desirable in the best interest of the inst^n. The ~~it brings in a good~~ income in the first instance, it results in the gradual deterioration of the lands & ultimate loss to the inst^n

and in respect of the other auction pur-
chaser Channappa, who is said to have been already put in possession of the lands, such compensation as the Dy. Comr may consider fair and reasonable in the circumstances of the case.

Memo
Mar. 65/1-22-4

Copy to the Asst. Comr with the records received with his letter no. C.14 dt 4-9-1923

Dy Rev. Secy

2.5.24.

Dy Rev. Secy
29/4/24

WD 0,65—GPB—2000—28 7 22

a laraja o ysore.

Muzrai Appeal No. 3 of 1923-24

Appellant.s	Vs.	Respondent
1. Bistappa 2. Jayathirthachar, and 3. Krishtachar.		1. Channappa 2. Khader Mohadin

Subject.

Appeal against order No.R.Dis.85 of 1922-23 dated 6-4-1923 of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore in the matter of the sale of the gutta of the Inam lands endowed to Sri Narayana Swami, Tirumaladevaru and Jibi Hanumanthadevaru temples at Hannahalli in the Kumsi Sub-Taluk.

The case was heard on 24th Nov. 1923 the parties were present in person, and the appellants were represented by their Advocate Mr. D. Sama Rao while the 1st respondent was represented by his Advocate Mr. B.S. Ranoji Rao.

O r d e r .

As a matter of policy Vahivatdars and Archaks and other temple servants who have been long in possession of the Inam lands attached

GPB—1,000—8-8-11

to

to the institution, should not be disturbed from the possession of the lands so long as they are prepared to pay such amount as may be fixed by the local officers towards the Reserve Fund ~~expenses~~ and this policy has been approved by Government in their order No. 2101 Muz.187-22 dated 18-1-1923. In the present case, the appellants are themselves responsible for the position ~~of~~ in which they are placed as they failed to pay regularly the amount fixed by the local officers and there was therefore no alternative left for them but to dispose of the lease of their lands by auction. However, as the appellants have been reported to have since repented of their folly, and paid up in full the arrears of the annual ~~lease~~ amount due from them, and ~~xxxx

records received with his letter No.C.14 dated 4-9-1923.

By order,

Revenue Secretary.





Dno. 114.

Muzg. 450-23-5.

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharajah of Mysore.

Review petition no. of 24-25.

Petitioner: Gajanna Channakka, residing at Honnahalli, Kunbi Sub-Taluk.

vs.

Opponents: (1) Bistappa.
(2) Jayathirthachar
(3) Kristachar,
Pahivatdars of Narasimhadevaru and other temples at Honnahalli, Kunsi Sub Taluk.

The petitioner above-named most respectfully begs to prefer this review petition against the order of Government in Muzarai appeal no. 3 of 1923-24 on the following among other grounds:

1. That the inam lands ought not to have been ordered to be left in possession of the opponents, who have admittedly failed to pay regularly

for a number of years the amount fixed by the local officers.

2. That the amounts fixed to be paid by the opponents is a nominal sum not amounting to more than Rs. 65/- a year whereas the amount realised by the sale of the Gutta of the Inam Lands is nearly Rs. 700/-

3. That the order of Government has greatly prejudiced the interests of the institutions in whose favour the Inam lands have been endowed.

4. That the temples have all been neglected for want of timely repairs, owing to paucity of funds, and the inam lands are not being properly cultivated, with the fear that the opponents may be asked to pay more by the local authorities towards the reserve for repairs, etc.

5. That there is no ground whatsoever for the Government to apprehend that 'a frequent change of lessees is not desirable for the reason that though it brings in a good income in the first instance, it results in the gradual deterioration of the lands and ultimate loss to the institution, as this would lend support in favour

have been condemned and even set aside as per provisions of the Mukurai Regulation.

6. That by way of assurance to Government that no loss will be caused to the Institutions, the petitioner is ready to enter into an agreement with Government undertaking to pay Rs. 200/- more than what has been realised by Sales of the Gutta of the Inam land. at present for a period of five years after the expiry of the present lease in favour of the petitioner.

7. That under Sec. 12 of the Mukurai Regulation, the Government ought not to have entertained the appeal and the opponents ought to have been referred to the District Court to get the matter adjudicated upon.

8. That the decision of the Government is opposed to law, facts and probabilities of the case and is highly prejudicial

51

to the interests of the Institutions concerned.

The petitioner, therefore prays that the above order of the Government may be kindly ~~revised~~ reversed and the sale of the Gutta of the Inam lands in favour of the petitioner be confirmed

Bangalore }
22nd July 24 }.

ಮಾನ್ಯರ ಸೇವಕರು
ನಾಲ್ಕೈದು ಅಲ್ಲಿ

G Ramanath.
V. Venugopal.
Advocates for
the petitioner





Before the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore

Mewrai Appeal No 3 of 1923-24

Appellants V/S. Respondents

1) Bishtappa
2) Jayathirthachar, and
3) Krishtachar

1) Chennappa
2) Madeemohadin

Subject

Appeal against the order No R. Dis. 85 of 1922-23 dated 6th April 1923 of the Mewrai Commissioner in Mysore in the matter of the Sale of the Gutta of the inam lands endowed to Sri Narayanaswami Tirumaladevaru and Sri Kamanthadevaru temples at Harnahalli in the Kunsi Sub-taluk

The Case was heard on the 24th November 1923 the parties were present in person and the appellants were represented by their advocate, Mr. D. Rama Rao, while the 1st respondent was represented by his advocate Mr. B. S. Ranoji Rao

Order

As a matter of policy

Valivaradhu:

been long in possession of the inam lands attached to the institution, should not be disturbed from the possession of the lands by [illegible] as they are prepared to pay such amount as may be fixed by the local officers towards the reserve fund, and this policy has been approved by Government in their order no 2101—Misc 187-22. dated 18th January 1923. In the present case, the appellants are themselves responsible for the position in which they are placed as they failed to pay regularly the amount fixed by the local officers and there was therefore no alternative left for them but to dispose of the lease of the lands by auction. However, as the appellants have been reported to have since repented of their folly and paid up in full the arrears of the annual amount due from them and as in the case of institutions a frequent change of lessees is not desirable for the reason that though it brings in a good income in the 1st instance it results in the gradual deterioration of the lands and ultimate loss

of the Mysore Commissioner's order that the appellants be left undisturbed in the possession of the lands on their paying as Compensation interest at 12 per cent on the amount paid by the auction purchaser Kader Mohadumbhoy has not yet been put in possession of the lands based out to him and in respect of the other auction purchaser Channappa who is said to have been already put in possession of the lands, such Compensation as the Deputy Commissioner may consider fair and reasonable in the circumstances of the case

Memo No 1644—Mur 450-22-4
dated 13th May 1924

Copy of the above is forwarded to the Mysore Commissioner in Mysore with the Records received with his letter No 14 dated 4th September 1923

By order
(Sd) K.V. Anantasamam
Secretary to Government
Revenue Department

Copy
Examined
Superintendent
Mysore Port and
General and Revenue Departments
PTO

Copy sent
compd

Copy uploaded for by Chennapp
on 12.7.24
Received on 14.7.24
uploaded on 14.7.24
No/words: 450
Copying fee Rs. 130

R PEES ಪೀಸ್-೨

Before the Government of His Highness The Maharajah of Mysore.

ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ.

Muzarai Review petition no.

1924 — 25 ನೇ ನಂಬರು.

Petitioner
ವಾದಿಯೂ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್.

Appellants.
ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ ಯೂ ಅಪ್ಪೋನೆಂಟ್,

Gajanur Chamappa ..... } Vs. { 1. Bistappa ..... 2. Jagathnathachar ..... 3. Krishnachar .....

ಮಾನ್ಯರಾದ G. Paramasivaiah, B.A., LL.B and M. Venugopal, B.A., LL.B } ಯವರಿಗೆ.

Petitioner ಬರಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್‌ನಾಮಾ.

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಅಪ್ಪೈರುವರುವಿಗೂ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವಾದ ಜರಗಿಸುವದಕ್ಕೂ, ನನ್ನ ಪರ ಆಗುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಧವಾದ ಆರ್ಡರನ್ನೂ ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯನ್ನೂ ಜಾರಿಕ್ರಮ ನಡಿಸಿ ಹಣ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ, ನನಗೆ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ಸಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಮೊಬಲಗು, ತಿಲ್ಕು ಮೊಬಲಗು ರೀಫಂಡು ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಪು ಮೊಬಲಗು ದಸ್ತೈವಜು ವಗೈರೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ಪಡೆಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹ ತಮಗೆ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತಾವಾಗಲಿ ಯಾ ತಮಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಮತ್ಯಾವ ಲಾಯರ್‌ರಾಗಲಿ ಡಿಪೋ ಮೊಬದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡಿಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಮುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ಇಹೆನೆ.

ರುಜು ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಸಾಲದಾಗಿರುತ್ತೆ

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮಾ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯಸ್ತರಾಗಿ ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. } ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮಾ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇಹೆನೆ.

G.P.

Bangalore.

ತಾರೀಖು 22.7.24.

Advocates for the petitioner

ಎ 24 ಸಾರುವೆಳ್ಳೆ—ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಬಜಾರ್, ಚಿಕ್ಕಪೇಟೆ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ.

S. G. N. Press, Bangalore City.

SUBJECT .....

Diary No. of letter replied to _____

Section Inwz.
File No. 450-22.
Serial No. 6.

Muzrai Secretariat
( )
, *the* 192 .

No. 278

Date of issue 22.8.24

Signed by Dy T Ramanya

To

Endorsement. granting to Gajanur Channappa Honnali, Kumsi Sub-Taluk, with ref. to his review application regd. no. 114 praying that on a reconsideration of no. 1644 - Inwz. 450-22 dt 13-5-24, the sale of the inam over. lands

endowed to Sri Narayana Swami and other temples at Harnahalli, Kunigal Sub-Taluk, in his favour, may be confirmed to him.

The petn is informed that there are no fresh grounds for a re-consideration of the orders already passed. His application is accordingly rejected.

By order

[illegible] 14-8-22

Rev. Secretary

2794/22-4 [illegible]

Copy to Tumkur Commr in Cancn of S.O.No. 1644 dt 13-8-22.

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

WD 0563—G.P.B—2,500—27-7 22

[illegible] 19.8.22

By Rev. Secretary

dt 18/8/22